

REMARKS

Claims 1-72 are pending, with claims 1, 43, and 61 being independent.

Interview Summary

Applicant and Applicant's representative wish to thank Examiner Dennison for the assistance extended during the telephone interviews held on May 17, 2005 and May 24, 2005. In view of the discussion during the interviews, the foregoing amendments, and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Rejections under the Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1-12, 43-52, and 61-72 stand provisionally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9, 12-14, 21-30, and 34-45 of copending Application No. 09/810,511. Applicants will address the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection upon indication that the claims are otherwise allowable.

Rejections under Section 103

Claims 1-37, 43-56, and 61-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed (6,671,739) in view of Kikinis (6,167,120). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Office Action indicates claim 1 may be interpreted to indicate that the claimed system assigns independent Internet addresses to multiple home networked client devices to enable the client devices to communicate with a host system over a single communication tunnel (Office Action of March 10, 2005, paragraph 40). As discussed in the telephone interviews, claim 1 has been amended to clearly indicate that the host system assigns the independent Internet addresses to the client devices to enable the client devices to communicate with the host system over the single communication tunnel.

As discussed in the response to the Office Action dated July 27, 2004, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Reed and Kikinis, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest a host system that assigns independent Internet addresses

Applicant : David C. Chiles et al.  
Serial No. : 09/810,421  
Filed : March 19, 2001  
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-091001 / Home  
Networking 02

to the home-networked client devices such that the client devices may communicate in individual communication sessions with the host system over a single communication tunnel, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 1 and its respective dependent claims.

Similarly, independent claims 43 and 61 recite an arrangement in which a host system assigns independent Internet addresses to the home-networked client devices such that the client devices may communicate with the host system in individual communication sessions over a single communication tunnel. Claims 43 and 61 have been amended to more clearly indicate that the host system assigns the independent Internet addresses to the client devices. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 43 and 61 and their respective dependent claims for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 38-42 and 57-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed and Kikinis, and further in view of Leung (6,487,605). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Leung does not remedy the failure of Reed and Kikinis to describe or suggest the features recited in the independent claims.

Enclosed is a check for \$790 for the Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/30/2005

  
W. Karl Renner  
Reg. No. 41,265

**PTO Customer No.: 26171**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331  
40271704.doc

